arXiv:1506.07543v4 [math.NA] 27 Nov 2015

A SUPERCONVERGENT HDG METHOD FOR THE INCOMPRESSIBLE NAVIER-STOKES EQUATIONS ON GENERAL POLYHEDRAL MESHES

WEIFENG QIU AND KE SHI

Abstract. We present a superconvergent hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) method for the steady-state incompressible Navier-Stokes equations on general polyhedral meshes. For arbitrary conforming polyhedral mesh, we use polynomials of degree $k+1$, k, k to approximate the velocity, velocity gradient and pressure, respectively. In contrast, we only use polynomials of degree k to approximate the numerical trace of the velocity on the interfaces. Since the numerical trace of the velocity field is the only globally coupled unknown, this scheme allows a very efficient implementation of the method. For the stationary case, and under the usual smallness condition for the source term, we prove that the method is well defined and that the global L^2-norm of the error in each of the above-mentioned variables and the discrete H^1-norm of the error in the velocity converge with the order of $k+1$ for $k \geq 0$. We also show that for $k \geq 1$, the global L^2-norm of the error in velocity converges with the order of $k+2$. From the point of view of degrees of freedom of the globally coupled unknown: numerical trace, this method achieves optimal convergence for all the above-mentioned variables in L^2-norm for $k \geq 0$, superconvergence for the velocity in the discrete H^1-norm without postprocessing for $k \geq 0$, and superconvergence for the velocity in L^2-norm without postprocessing for $k \geq 1$.

1. Introduction

In this paper, we consider a new hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin (HDG) method for the steady-state incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, which can be written as the following first order system:

$$\mathrm{L} = \nabla \boldsymbol{u} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.1a}$$

$$-\nu \nabla \cdot \mathrm{L} + \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}) + \nabla p = \boldsymbol{f} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.1b}$$

$$\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{1.1c}$$

$$\boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{0} \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega, \tag{1.1d}$$

$$\int_\Omega p = 0, \tag{1.1e}$$

where the unknowns are the velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$, the pressure p, and the gradient of the velocity L. ν is the kinematic viscosity and $\boldsymbol{f} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega)$ is the external body force. The domain $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, $d = 2, 3$ is polygonal ($d = 2$) or polyhedral ($d = 3$).

To define the HDG method, we adopt the notations and norms used in [6]. We consider conforming triangulation $\mathcal{T}_h$ of Ω made of shape-regular *polyhedral elements* which can be non-convex. We denote by $\mathcal{E}_h$ the set of all faces F of all elements $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$ and set $\partial\mathcal{T}_h := \{\partial K : K \in \mathcal{T}_h\}$. For scalar-valued functions ϕ and ψ, we write

$$(\phi, \psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} (\phi, \psi)_K, \ \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} := \sum_{K \in \mathcal{T}_h} \langle \phi, \psi \rangle_{\partial K}.$$

Here $(\cdot, \cdot)_D$ denotes the integral over the domain $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_D$ denotes the integral over $D \subset \mathbb{R}^{d-1}$. For vector-valued and matrix-valued functions, a similar notation is taken. For example, for vector-valued functions, we write $(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\psi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} := \sum_{i=1}^n (\phi_i, \psi_i)_{\mathcal{T}_h}$. For matrix-valued functions, we write $(\phi, \psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} := \sum_{1 \leq i,j \leq n} (\phi_{ij}, \psi_{ij})_{\mathcal{T}_h}$.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 65N30.

Key words and phrases. Discontinuous Galerkin, hybridization, Navier-Stokes equations, superconvergence, general polyhedral mesh.

Weifeng Qiu is partially supported by a grant from the Research Grants Council of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, China (Project No. CityU 11302014). As a convention the names of the authors are alphabetically ordered. Both authors contributed equally in this article.

Like all other HDG schemes, to define the HDG method for the problem, we introduce an additional unknown *numerical trace* which is the approximation of the velocity on the skeleton of the mesh. Namely, our HDG method seeks an approximation $(\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$ to the exact solution $(\mathrm{L}|_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \boldsymbol{u}|_{\mathcal{T}_h}, p|_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \boldsymbol{u}|_{\mathcal{E}_h})$ where the finite dimensional spaces are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{G}_h &:= \{\mathrm{G} \in \mathrm{L}^2(\Omega): \quad \mathrm{G}|_K \in \mathrm{P}_k(K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\},\\
\boldsymbol{V}_h &:= \{\boldsymbol{v} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(\Omega): \quad \boldsymbol{v}|_K \in \boldsymbol{P}_{k+1}(K), \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\},\\
Q_h &:= \{p \in L_0^2(\Omega): \quad p|_K \in P_k(K), \quad \forall K \in \mathcal{T}_h\},\\
\boldsymbol{M}_h &:= \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h): \boldsymbol{\mu}|_F \in \boldsymbol{P}_k(F), \quad \forall F \in \mathcal{E}_h\},\\
\boldsymbol{M}_h^0 &:= \{\boldsymbol{\mu} \in \boldsymbol{M}_h: \quad \boldsymbol{\mu}|_{\partial\Omega} = 0\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $P_l(D)$ denotes the set of polynomials of total degree at most $l \geq 0$ defined on D, $\boldsymbol{P}_k(D)$ denotes the set of vector-valued functions whose d components lie in $P_k(D)$, $\mathrm{P}_k(D)$ denotes the set of square matrix-valued functions whose $d \times d$ entries also lie in $P_k(D)$, and $L_0^2(\Omega) = \{p \in L^2(\Omega) : \int_\Omega p = 0\}$.

The method determines the approximate solution by requiring that it solves the following weak formulation:

$$(\mathrm{L}_h, \mathrm{G})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \nabla \cdot \mathrm{G})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h, \mathrm{G}\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = 0, \tag{1.2a}$$

$$\begin{aligned}(\nu \mathrm{L}_h, \nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\boldsymbol{u}_h \otimes \boldsymbol{u}_h, \nabla \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (p_h, \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \nu \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_h \boldsymbol{n} - \widehat{p}_h \boldsymbol{n} - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h \otimes \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}&\\
-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_h)\, \boldsymbol{u}_h, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h \otimes (\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = (\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h},&\end{aligned} \tag{1.2b}$$

$$-(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \nabla q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n}, q\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = 0, \tag{1.2c}$$

$$\langle \nu \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_h \boldsymbol{n} - \widehat{p}_h \boldsymbol{n} - (\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h \otimes \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\mu}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = 0, \tag{1.2d}$$

for all $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$. Here,

$$(\nu \widehat{\mathrm{L}}_h - \widehat{p}_h)\boldsymbol{n} := \nu \mathrm{L}_h \boldsymbol{n} - p_h \boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) - \tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)(\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \quad \text{on } \partial\mathcal{T}_h, \tag{1.2e}$$

$$\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) := \max(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h \cdot \boldsymbol{n}, 0) \quad \text{on each } F \in \partial\mathcal{T}_h. \tag{1.2f}$$

Here $\mathit{\Pi}_M$ is the L^2-projection onto $\boldsymbol{M}_h$. The goal of this paper is to consider the analytical aspects of the method including the rigorous proof of the uniqueness and existence of the solution of the above system and the error estimates for all unknowns. The computational aspects of the method will be discussed in a separate paper.

Like other HDG schemes, the HDG method (1.2) uses the numerical trace of the primary variable $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h$ as the only globally-coupled variable. Our formulation is close to that of the HDG method in [6, 23], in which they have the same global degrees of freedom $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h$. Nevertheless, there are three crucial differences which lead to special properties of our HDG method. Firstly, our method uses $\boldsymbol{P}_{k+1}(\mathcal{T}_h)$ to approximate the primary variable, which is the velocity, on each element while methods in [6, 23] uses $\boldsymbol{P}_k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ instead. Secondly, the diffusion part of the stabilization function $\frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)$ in (1.2e) is totally different from those used in [6, 23]. Finally, motivated by the work in [29] and [8], we insert two terms $-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_h)\, \boldsymbol{u}_h, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}$ and $\langle \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h \otimes (\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$ in (1.2b). As a consequence of the above modifications, the new HDG method allows to use general polygonal mesh with optimal approximations for all unknowns. In addition, from the implementation point of view, like many other numerical methods for Navier-Stokes equation, we apply the classical Picard iteration to obtain the numerical solution. In each iteration we need to solve an Oseen equation. Due to our modification in (1.2b), we can use the convection field obtained from previous step directly without the use of postprocessing. We notice that by adding these two terms in (1.2b), the HDG method (1.2) is not locally conservative (see [8] for detailed explanation). On the other hand, since the HDG method (1.2) has high order accuracy for the approximations to all variables, lack of being locally conservative is only a minor issue.

It is worth to mention that the HDG method using an enhanced space for the primary variable and the special stabilization function like $\frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)$ was first introduced by Lehrenfeld in Remark 1.2.4 for diffusion problem in [20]. He numerically showed that the methods provide optimal order of convergence for all unknowns without analysis. In [25], we gave rigorous analysis for this approach for linear elasticity problems. Optimal order of convergence for all unknowns is obtained for both equations. In [24], Oikawa analyzed a

HDG method for diffusion problem which uses the same polynomial spaces as in [20], with a different choice of the numerical flux, he proved the optimality of the method for all unknowns. Since the polynomial order of the numerical trace of these HDG methods [20, 25, 24] is one less then that of the approximation space of the primary variable, from the point of view of degrees of freedom of the globally coupled unknown, they obtain superconvergence for the primary variable without postprocessing. In addition, all these methods work on general polyhedral meshes. However, the standard stability analysis for these methods can only provide the upper bound of

$$\big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}^2 + h^{-1}\|\varPi_M \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2\big)^{1/2},$$

which can not control the standard discrete H^1-norm of $\boldsymbol{u}_h$. We would like to emphasize that the control of the standard discrete H^1-norm of $\boldsymbol{u}_h$ is essentially necessary in the proof of the HDG method (1.2) having a unique solution. In [26], roughly speaking, we prove that

$$\big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}^2 + h^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2\big)^{1/2} \le C\big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}^2 + h^{-1}\|\varPi_M \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2\big)^{1/2}. \tag{1.3}$$

The inequality (1.3) enables us to control the standard discrete H^1-norm of $\boldsymbol{u}_h$ of the HDG method (1.2) such that we can show our method has a unique solution under the usual smallness condition for the source term.

In literature, there are many existing mixed and DG methods designed for Navier-Stokes equations. See the classic mixed methods [13, 2, 12], the stabilized methods proposed in [17, 16, 19] and the DG methods [1, 18, 7, 14, 28, 27, 5, 8, 9, 10, 21]. An IP-like method and a compact discontinuous Galerkin (CDG) method were introduced in [22]. Recently, In [3], a mixed method is developed based on the pseudostress-velocity formulation. This method uses row-wise k-th order RT space and $\boldsymbol{P}_k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ to approximate the pseudostress and velocity, respectively. The method provides the convergence of both variables in L^3 norm of order $k+1-\frac{d}{6}$. In [4], a modified method is introduced and it approximates the pressure directly with same convergence rate as in [3]. Later in [15], a new mixed finite element method is introduced in which the stress is the primary variable. This method uses $\mathrm{P}_k(\mathcal{T}_h)$, row-wise k-th order RT space and $\boldsymbol{P}_k(\mathcal{T}_h)$ to approximate the velocity gradient, stress and velocity, respectively. The convergence of the velocity gradient and velocity in L^2-norm and the stress in $H(\text{div})$-norm is of order k. More recently, in 2015, Cockburn et al [6] gave an error analysis of the HDG method developed in [23] which is close to method in this paper. Our method may be criticized by the fact that with the modification of the scheme, we no longer have the local conservation of the momentum. Nevertheless, our approach has several advantages comparing with the one in [6, 23]. For instance, the analysis in [6, 23] is only valid for simplicical meshes and it needs a postprocessing procedure to obtain superconvergent approximation to the velocity. The method in [6, 23] does not have superconvergent approximation to the velocity in the discrete H^1-norm if $k = 0$, while our method does even this the lowest order case. From the implementation point of view, in each iteration, the scheme in [6, 23] needs to solve a Oseen equation using a postprocessed convection field from the previous iteration while in our scheme we can use the velocity field directly from the previous iteration without any postprocessing.

In this paper, we prove that the discrete H^1-norm of the error in the velocity, the L^2-norm of the error in the velocity, the pressure and even in the velocity gradient converge with the order $k+1$ for any $k \ge 0$; and that the velocity, for $k \ge 1$, converges with order $k+2$. Notice that as a built-in feature of HDG methods, see [11], the degrees of freedom of the globally-coupled unknown comes from the numerical trace of the velocity on the mesh skeleton. From the point of view of the global degrees of freedom, the method provides optimal convergent approximations to the velocity, velocity gradient and pressure in L^2-norm for $k \ge 0$, superconvergent approximation to the velocity in the discrete H^1-norm without postprocessing for $k \ge 1$, and superconvergent approximation to the velocity in L^2 norm without postprocessing for $k \ge 1$. In addition, the analysis of our method is valid for general polyhedral meshes. To the best of our knowledge, no other known finite element method for the Navier-Stokes equations has all of these properties.

The rest of paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce our HDG method for the problem and present the main a priori error estimates. In Section 3, we present some preliminary inequalities and stability estimates. In Section 4, we prove the existence and uniqueness of the numerical solution. In Section 5, we provide the detailed proof of the main results.

2. Main Results

In this section, we present the main error estimates results. To state the main results, we need to introduce some notations. We use the standard definitions for the Sobolev spaces $W^{\ell,p}(D)$ for a given domain D with norm

$$\|\phi\|_{\ell,p,D} = (\sum_{|\alpha|\leq \ell} \|D^{\alpha}\phi\|^p_{0,p,D})^{1/p}.$$

For vector- and matrix-valued functions $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ and Φ, we use $\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\ell,p,D} = \sum_{i=1}^d \|\boldsymbol{\phi}_i\|_{\ell,p,D}$, and $\|\Phi\|_{\ell,p,D} = \sum_{i,j=1}^d \|\Phi_{ij}\|_{\ell,p,D}$. Moreover, when $p = 2$ and $\ell < \infty$, we denote $W^{\ell,2}(D)$ by $H^{\ell}(D)$ and $\|\cdot\|_{\ell,2,D}$, by $\|\cdot\|_{\ell,D}$. When $l = 0$, we denote $W^{0,p}(D)$ by $L^p(D)$ and the norm by $\|\cdot\|_{L^p(D)}$, when $\ell = 0$ and $p = 2$, we denote the $L^2(D)$ norm by $\|\cdot\|_D$.

We also introduce the following norms and seminorms:

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\|\!|_{0,h} &:= \Big(\|\boldsymbol{v}\|^2_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\|h_K^{1/2}\boldsymbol{\mu}\|^2_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|h_K^{1/2}(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{\mu})\|^2_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})\Big)^{1/2} && \forall\, (\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ in } \boldsymbol{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)\times \boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h),\\
\|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\|\!|_{1,h} &:= \Big(\|\nabla \boldsymbol{v}\|^2_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|h_K^{-1/2}(\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{\mu})\|^2_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\Big)^{1/2} && \forall\, (\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ in } \boldsymbol{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)\times \boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h),\\
\|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\|\!|_{\infty,h} &:= \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} + \|\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{L^\infty(\mathcal{E}_h)} && \forall\, (\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \text{ in } \boldsymbol{L}^\infty(\Omega)\times \boldsymbol{L}^\infty(\mathcal{E}_h).
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\|\cdot\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} := \big(\sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\cdot\|^2_{\partial K}\big)^{1/2}$. We also set

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{0,h} := \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \quad \|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{1,h} := \|\!|(\boldsymbol{v}, \{\!\{\boldsymbol{v}\}\!\})\|\!|_{1,h},$$

where the average of $\boldsymbol{v}$, $\{\!\{\boldsymbol{v}\}\!\}$, is defined as follows: On an interior face $F = \partial K^- \cap \partial K^+$, we have $\{\!\{\boldsymbol{v}\}\!\} := \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{v}^+ + \boldsymbol{v}^-)$, where $\boldsymbol{v}^{\pm}$ denote the trace of $\boldsymbol{v}$ from the interior of $K^{\pm}$ and $\boldsymbol{n}^{\pm}$ is the outward unit normal to $K^{\pm}$. On a boundary face $F \subset \partial K^- \cap \partial\Omega$, we formally set $\boldsymbol{v}^+ := \boldsymbol{v}$ such that $\{\!\{\boldsymbol{v}\}\!\} = \boldsymbol{v}$ on $\partial\Omega$. We note that $\|\cdot\|_{1,h}$ is the standard discrete H^1-seminorm.

We are now ready to state our first main result on the existence and uniqueness of the numerical solution.

Theorem 2.1 (Existence, uniqueness and stability)**.** *If* $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega$ *is small enough, the HDG method* (1.2) *has a unique solution* $(\mathrm{L}, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$*. Furthermore, the following stability bound is satisfied*

$$\|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)\|\!|_{1,h} \leq C\nu^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega. \tag{2.1}$$

for some constant C *independent of* ν*, the discretization parameters and the exact solution.*

Next we present the error estimates result for all unknowns. In order to have optimal L^2-error estimate for the velocity, we need some regularity assumption of the following dual problem. Consider the problem of seeking $(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \psi)$ such that

$$\Phi - \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{2.2a}$$

$$-\nu\nabla\cdot\Phi - \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}) - \nabla\psi - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})^\top\boldsymbol{u} + \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{u})^\top\boldsymbol{\phi} = \boldsymbol{\theta} \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{2.2b}$$

$$\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi} = 0 \quad \text{in } \Omega, \tag{2.2c}$$

$$\boldsymbol{\phi} = 0 \quad \text{on } \partial\Omega. \tag{2.2d}$$

Assume that the solution to the dual problem satisfies the following regularity estimate:

$$\|\Phi\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{2,\Omega} + \|\psi\|_{1,\Omega} \leq C_r\|\boldsymbol{\theta}\|_\Omega. \tag{2.3}$$

Remark 2.2. If $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is small enough compared with the diffusion coefficient ν, the dual problem (2.2) has a unique solution $(\boldsymbol{\phi},\psi) \in \boldsymbol{H}_0^1(\Omega)\times H^1(\Omega)/\mathbb{R}$. In fact, when we use the standard energy argument, we need to have

$$\frac{1}{2}|((\nabla\boldsymbol{u})^\top\boldsymbol{\phi} - (\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})^\top\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\phi})_\Omega| \leq \nu\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi}\|^2_\Omega \tag{2.4}$$

to obtain energy estimate of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. We notice that $\frac{1}{2}|((\nabla\boldsymbol{u})^\top\boldsymbol{\phi} - (\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})^\top\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{\phi})_\Omega| \leq C\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|^2_{H^1(\Omega)}$. It is easy to see that (2.4) holds if $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$ is small enough compared with the diffusion coefficient ν. This completes the proof of the above claim. If we further assume $\boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{W}^{1,3}(\Omega)\cap\boldsymbol{L}^\infty(\Omega)$, then, the regularity assumption (2.3) comes from a standard regularity estimate [13] for the Stokes equations.

Now we are ready to present our second and main result:

Theorem 2.3. *If $\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega$ is small enough, then we have*

$$\|\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{L}_h\|_\Omega+\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_\Omega+\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{1,h}+\|p-p_h\|_\Omega\le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1},$$

Here the constant $\mathcal{C}$ depends on $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega},\|p\|_{k+1,\Omega},\nu$ and k. In addition, if the regularity assumption (2.3) holds and $\boldsymbol{u}\in\boldsymbol{W}^{1,\infty}(\Omega)$, then for $k\ge 1$ we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_\Omega\le \mathcal{C}_Dh^{k+2}.$$

Here $\mathcal{C}_D$ depends on $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^\infty(\Omega)},\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega},\|p\|_{k+1,\Omega},\nu$ and k,C_r.

3. Preliminary estimates

In this section, we present some preliminary inequalities for the proof of our main results. First, we would like to recall an important inequality which was introduced in [26]. Here we write it in a slightly general way. Though our results in this section and the following ones are valid for conforming meshes with shape regular assumption, we assume the meshes are quasi-uniform for the sake of simplicity.

Lemma 3.1. *For any given function $(\mathrm{L},\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\mathrm{G}_h\times\boldsymbol{V}_h\times\boldsymbol{M}_h$ satisfying (1.2a), then we have*

$$|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\le C_{HDG}(\|\mathrm{L}\|_\Omega+h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{v}-\boldsymbol{\mu}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}).$$

For the proof of the above result, we refer the Lemma 3.2 in [26]. In addition, we also need the following basic inequalities:

Lemma 3.2. *For $1\le q<\infty\,(d=2)$, $1\le q\le 4\,(d=3)$, there exist positive constant C_q such that*

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}\le C_q\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{1,h},\qquad \forall\ \boldsymbol{v}\in\boldsymbol{V}(h),\tag{3.1a}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^q(\Omega)}\le C_q|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})|\!|\!|_{1,h},\qquad \forall\ (\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\boldsymbol{V}(h)\times\boldsymbol{M}_h^0,\tag{3.1b}$$

Here $\boldsymbol{V}(h):=\boldsymbol{H}_0^1(\Omega)+\boldsymbol{V}_h$. In addition, we have a trace inequality:

$$\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\le Ch^{-\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{1,h}\le Ch^{-\frac{1}{4}}|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})|\!|\!|_{1,h},\qquad \forall\ (\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})\in\boldsymbol{V}(h)\times\boldsymbol{M}_h^0.\tag{3.1c}$$

The proofs of (3.1a)-(3.1c) are provided in Proposition A.2 in [6], Proposition 4.5 and (7.7) in [18]. To simplify our notations, we group all the nonlinear terms in our formulation as the following operator:

Definition 3.3. For any $(\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})\in\boldsymbol{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)\times\boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h)$, we define the operator:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}});(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})):=&-(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w},\nabla\boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\boldsymbol{w}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\&+\langle\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.\end{aligned}$$

The above operator plays a crucial rule in the analysis. It has the following coercive property:

Proposition 3.4. *For any $(\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})\in\boldsymbol{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_h)\times\boldsymbol{L}^2(\boldsymbol{E}_h)$, if $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}|_{\partial\Omega}=0$, then we have*

$$\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}});(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}))=\langle(\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})-\frac{1}{2}\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\ge 0.$$

Proof. By Definition 3.3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}});(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})):=&-(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\boldsymbol{w}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\&+\langle\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.\end{aligned}$$

Applying integration by parts for the first term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}&=-(\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w}),\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\&=-((\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}-(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.\end{aligned}$$

This implies that

$$-(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\boldsymbol{w})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}=0.$$

Inserting above identity into $\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}});(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}))$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}});(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})) &= \langle\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}-\langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{u}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\ &= \langle(\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})-\frac{1}{2}\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}-\langle\frac{1}{2}(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n})\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\ &= \langle(\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})-\frac{1}{2}\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}\cdot\boldsymbol{n})(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\geq 0.\end{aligned}$$

The last step is due to the fact that $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}$ is single valued on $\mathcal{E}_h$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}|_{\partial\Omega}=0$. $\square$

Next, we present a continuity result for the nonlinear operator $\mathcal{O}$ that we will use throughout the analysis. We first define the following space:

$$\widetilde{\boldsymbol{H}_0^1}(\Omega):=\{(\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}})\in\boldsymbol{H}_0^1(\Omega)\times L^2(\mathcal{E}_h)|\boldsymbol{w}|_{\mathcal{E}_h}=\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}\},$$

The above space is the graph space of the trace mapping from $\boldsymbol{H}^1(\Omega)$ onto $\boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h)$. We are ready to state the following result:

Lemma 3.5. *There is a positive constant $C_{\mathcal{O}}$ such that*
(3.2)
$$|\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}))-\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}))|\leq C_{\mathcal{O}}|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1)-(\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2)|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})|\!|\!|_{1,h},$$

for all $(\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1),(\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2),(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})\in\widetilde{\boldsymbol{H}_0^1}(\Omega)+\big(\boldsymbol{V}_h\times\boldsymbol{M}_h^0\big)$ and any $(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})\in\boldsymbol{V}_h\times\boldsymbol{M}_h^0$.

Proof. Setting $\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}:=\boldsymbol{w}_1-\boldsymbol{w}_2,\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}:=\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1-\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2$, by the definition of the operator $\mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}))-\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}))=\\ &\qquad-(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}},\nabla\boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}-(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\ &\qquad+\langle(\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1)-\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2))(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},\end{aligned}$$

applying intergration by parts in the first term, rearranging the terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}&=(\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+(\boldsymbol{v}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\ &\quad+\langle(\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1)-\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2))(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}),\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}+\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}-\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\ &=T_1+T_2+T_3+T_4+T_5.\end{aligned}$$

Next we estimate each T_i.

For T_1, we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality,

$$T_1\leq\|\nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}\leq C|\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})|\!|\!|_{1,h},$$

the second inequality is due to (3.1b). T_2 can be bounded in a similar way.

For T_3, we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality,

$$T_3\leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\leq C|\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})|\!|\!|_{1,h},$$

the second inequality is by (3.1c).

For T_4, by the generalized Hölder's inequality we have:

$$T_4\leq C\|\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1)-\tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2)\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;\|\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;\|\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)},$$

by the fact that the function $\max(\boldsymbol{w}\cdot\boldsymbol{n},0)$ is Lipschitz,

$$\begin{aligned}&\leq C\|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;\|\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\;\|\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\\ &\leq Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}(\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}+\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)})\;|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}\;\|\boldsymbol{v}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)},\end{aligned}$$

Notice here if $(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}) \in \widetilde{\boldsymbol{H}_0^1}(\Omega) + \big(\boldsymbol{V}_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0\big)$, then $\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}} \in \boldsymbol{V}_h|_{\mathcal{T}_h}$. Hence, we can apply inverse inequality on $\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}, \|\boldsymbol{v} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}$ to have

$$\begin{aligned} &\le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}\big(h^{\frac{1-d}{4}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)} + \|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\big)\ \|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!\|_{1,h}\ h^{\frac{1-d}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{v} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)} \\ &\le Ch^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})|\!\|_{1,h}\ \|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!\|_{1,h}\ \|\!|(\boldsymbol{v}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})|\!\|_{1,h}, \end{aligned}$$

by (3.1c) and the fact that $d = 2, 3$.

Finally, for T_5 we first break it into two terms:

$$T_5 = -\langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes (\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle((\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}) \otimes \delta_{\boldsymbol{w}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

For the first term, by the generalized Hölder's inequality, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes (\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{v}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &\le h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\ h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)} \\ &\le h^{\frac{1}{4}}(\|\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)})\ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}}\|_{L^2(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\ h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{v}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)} \\ &\le C\|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{w}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}})|\!\|_{1,h}\ \|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}})|\!\|_{1,h}\ \|\!|(\boldsymbol{v}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{v}})|\!\|_{1,h}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we used the same argument as in T_4 for the term $\|\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}$ and (3.1c). The second term can be estimated in a similar way. We complete the proof by combining the estimates of T_i. ☐

4. Uniqueness and existence of the numerical solution.

We will apply the Picard fixed point theorem to show the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (1.2). To this end, we begin by rewriting the method into a more compact and appropriate form for the proof. If we add (1.2a) - (1.2d), the method can be written as: Find $(\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$ such that

$$\mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = (\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \tag{4.1}$$

for all $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$. Here the bilinear form $\mathcal{S}(\cdot, \cdot)$ is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu})) := {} & (\mathrm{L}_h, \mathrm{G})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \nabla\cdot\mathrm{G})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h, \mathrm{G}\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (\boldsymbol{v}, \nabla\cdot\nu\mathrm{L}_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\boldsymbol{\mu}, \nu\mathrm{L}_h\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ & - (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \nabla q)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, q\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + (\boldsymbol{v}, \nabla p_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle\boldsymbol{\mu}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, p_h\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ & + \langle\frac{\nu}{h}(\varPi_M\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), \boldsymbol{v} - \boldsymbol{\mu}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

We also define a mapping $\mathcal{F}$ as follows: for any $(\boldsymbol{w}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}) \in \boldsymbol{H}^1(\mathcal{T}_h) \times \boldsymbol{L}^2(\mathcal{E}_h)$, $(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) = \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{w}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}) \in \boldsymbol{V}_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h$ is part of the solution $(\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$ of

$$\mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu})) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = (\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h}, \tag{4.2}$$

for all $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$. It is worth to mention that when $\boldsymbol{w} \in \boldsymbol{H}(\mathrm{div}, \Omega), \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w} = 0$ and $\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}} = \boldsymbol{w}|_{\mathcal{E}_h}$, the above system is a HDG scheme for the Oseen equation. Clearly, $(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)$ is a solution of (1.2) if and only if it is a fixed point of the mapping $\mathcal{F}$. Next we present a stability result for the above scheme.

Lemma 4.1. *If $(\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$ is a solution of (4.2), then there exists a constant C that solely depends on the constants C_{HDG} and C_2 in Lemma 3.1, 3.2 such that*

$$\|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)|\!\|_{1,h} \le C\nu^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega}.$$

Proof. Taking $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (\nu\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)$ in (4.2), after some algebraic manipulation, we have a simplified equation:

$$\nu\|\mathrm{L}_h\|_{\Omega}^2 + \langle\frac{\nu}{h}(\varPi_M\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)) = (\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{u}_h)_{\Omega}.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 3.1, Young's inequality and Proposition 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned} \nu\|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)|\!\|_{1,h}^2 &\le 2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2\nu(\|\mathrm{L}_h\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{1}{h}\|\varPi_M\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2) \\ &\le 2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2\Big(\nu\|\mathrm{L}_h\|_{\Omega}^2 + \langle\frac{\nu}{h}(\varPi_M\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), \boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\Big) \\ &= 2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2(\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{u}_h)_{\Omega} \le 2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2\|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega} \le 2C_2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2\|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)|\!\|_{1,h}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_{\Omega}. \end{aligned}$$

The last step is by Lemma 3.2 with $q = 2$. This completes the proof with $C = 2C_2C_{\mathrm{HDG}}^2$. ☐

Inspired by the above stability result, we define a subspace of $\boldsymbol{V}_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$:

$$\mathcal{K}_h := \{(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \boldsymbol{V}_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0 : |\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \le C_2 C_{\rm HDG}^2 \nu^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega\}.$$

We are now ready to give the proof of the existence and uniqueness result for the HDG scheme (1.2)/(4.1).

Proof. **of Theorem 2.1.**
Clearly, $\mathcal{F}$ maps $\boldsymbol{V}_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$ into $\mathcal{K}_h$ hence it maps $\mathcal{K}_h$ into itself. In order to show the existence and uniqueness of the solution of (1.2)/(4.1), it suffices to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is a contraction on the subspace $\mathcal{K}_h$. To this end, let $(\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1),(\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2) \in K_h$ and $({\rm L}_i,\boldsymbol{u}_i,p_i,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_i)$ are the solutions of the problem (4.2) with $(\boldsymbol{w},\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}) = (\boldsymbol{w}_i,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_i)$, $(i=1,2)$. So we have $(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1) := \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1)$ and $(\boldsymbol{u}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_2) := \mathcal{F}(\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2)$. If we set $\delta_{\rm L} := L_1 - L_2$, $\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \boldsymbol{u}_1 - \boldsymbol{u}_2$, $\delta_p := p_1 - p_2$ and $\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} := \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_2$, due to the linearity of the operator $\mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\mathcal{S}((\delta_{\rm L},\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_p,\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}),({\rm G},\boldsymbol{v},q,\boldsymbol{\mu})) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_2),(\boldsymbol{v},\boldsymbol{\mu})) = 0,$$

for all $({\rm G},\boldsymbol{v},q,\boldsymbol{\mu}) \in {\rm G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$. Taking $({\rm G},\boldsymbol{v},q,\boldsymbol{\mu}) = (\nu\delta_{\rm L},\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_p,\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})$ into the above identity, after some algebraic manipulations, we obtain

$$\nu\|\delta_{\rm L}\|_\Omega^2 + \langle \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = -\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_2),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})).$$

Or

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|\delta_{\rm L}\|_\Omega^2 + \langle \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) &= \\ \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);&(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})).\end{aligned}$$

By Lemma 3.1 Young's inequality and Proposition 3.4 we have

$$\begin{aligned}\nu|\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}^2 &\le 2C_{\rm HDG}^2(\nu\|\delta_{\rm L}\|_\Omega^2 + \frac{\nu}{h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2) \\ &\le 2C_{\rm HDG}^2\left(\nu\|\delta_{\rm L}\|_\Omega^2 + \langle\frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\right) \\ &= 2C_{\rm HDG}^2\left(\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2);(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{w}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1);(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1),(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\right) \\ &\le 2C_{\mathcal{O}}C_{\rm HDG}^2|\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2|\!|\!|_{1,h}\ |\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{u}_1,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_1)|\!|\!|_{1,h}\ |\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \quad \text{by Lemma 3.5,} \\ &\le 2C_{\mathcal{O}}C_2C_{\rm HDG}^4\nu^{-1}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega\ |\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2|\!|\!|_{1,h}\ |\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \quad \text{by Lemma 4.1.}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have shown that

$$|\!|\!|(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \le 2C_{\mathcal{O}}C_2C_{\rm HDG}^4\nu^{-2}\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega\ |\!|\!|(\boldsymbol{w}_1 - \boldsymbol{w}_2,\widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_1 - \widehat{\boldsymbol{w}}_2|\!|\!|_{1,h}.$$

Obviously, the above bound implies that $\mathcal{F}$ is a contraction on $\mathcal{K}_h$ equipped with $|\!|\!|\cdot|\!|\!|_{1,h}$ provided

$$\|\boldsymbol{f}\|_\Omega \le \frac{\nu^2}{2C_{\mathcal{O}}C_2C_{\rm HDG}^4}.$$

By the fixed point theorem, there is a unique fixed point $(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h) \in \mathcal{K}_h$ of the mapping $\mathcal{F}$. It is also the unique solution of the system (1.2). This completes the proof. □

5. Proof of the error estimates

In this section, we provide the detailed proof of the main error estimates for all unknowns. We proceed in several steps.

Step 1: Error equations. We begin by introducing the error equations that we are going to use in the analysis. For convention, we introduce the following notations for the errors:

$$\begin{aligned} &e_{\rm L} := \mathit{\Pi}_G{\rm L} - {\rm L}_h, && e_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h, && e_p := \mathit{\Pi}_Q p - p_h, && e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} := \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h, \\ &\delta_{\rm L} := {\rm L} - \mathit{\Pi}_G{\rm L}, && \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u}, && \delta_p := p - \mathit{\Pi}_Q p, && \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} := \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}.\end{aligned}$$

Here $\mathit{\Pi}_G, \mathit{\Pi}_V, \mathit{\Pi}_Q, \mathit{\Pi}_M$ are the L^2-projections onto G_h, $\boldsymbol{V}_h, Q_h, \boldsymbol{M}_h$ respectively. In addition to the basic inequalities listed in Lemma 3.2, we will frequently use the following basic inequalities as well:

$$\|q\|_F \le C h_K^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|q\|_K, \qquad \text{for all } q \in P_l(K), (l \ge 0), \tag{5.1a}$$

$$\|D^m(q - \mathit{\Pi}_l q)\|_K \le C h_K^{l+1-m} \|q\|_{l+1,K}, \qquad \text{for all } q \in H^{l+1}(K),\ 0 \le m \le l, \tag{5.1b}$$

$$\|q - \mathit{\Pi}_l q\|_F \le C h_K^{l+\frac{1}{2}} \|q\|_{l+1,K}, \qquad \text{for all } q \in H^{l+1}(K),\ 0 \le m \le l, \tag{5.1c}$$

$$\|q - \mathit{\Pi}_M q\|_F \le C h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \|q\|_{k+1,K} \qquad \text{for all } q \in H^{l+1}(K), \tag{5.1d}$$

Here $\mathit{\Pi}_l$ denotes the L^2-projection onto $P_l(K)$, F denotes any face of K. In addition, we have the following estimate for the projections under the triple norm $\|\!|\cdot|\!\|_{1,h}$:

Proposition 5.1. *For any $\boldsymbol{u} \in \boldsymbol{H}^1(\Omega)$, we have*

$$\|\!|(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u})|\!\|_{1,h} \le C \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}. \tag{5.2}$$

Proof. By the definition of the norm $\|\!|\cdot|\!\|_{1,h}$, we have

$$\|\!|(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u})|\!\|_{1,h} \le 2(\|\nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}).$$

We are going to bound each of the above terms by $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}$. For the first term, we have

$$\|\nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} = \|\nabla(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} - \bar{\boldsymbol{u}})\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \le C h^{-1} \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} - \bar{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{0,\mathcal{T}_h},$$

here $\bar{\boldsymbol{u}}$ denotes the average of $\boldsymbol{u}$ within each element $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$, the inequality is by the inverse inequality of the polynomial spaces.

$$\|\nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \le C \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,h} = C \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega},$$

by the Poincaré inequality for each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$.

For the second term, applying a triangle inequality we have

$$h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le h^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) \le 2h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_k \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},$$

here $\mathit{\Pi}_k$ denotes the L^2-projection onto $\boldsymbol{P}_k(K)$ for each $K \in \mathcal{T}_h$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\le C(\|\nabla(\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_k \boldsymbol{u})\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{-1} \|\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_k \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}) \quad \text{by the trace inequality,} \\ &\le C \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}, \end{aligned}$$

the last step is by a similar argument as for the first term and (5.1). This completes the proof. ☐

It is not hard to verify that the exact solution $(\boldsymbol{u}, \mathrm{L}, p, \boldsymbol{u}|_{\mathcal{E}_h})$ satisfies the following equation:

$$\mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}); (\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = (\boldsymbol{f}, \boldsymbol{v})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \frac{\nu}{h} \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\,,\ \boldsymbol{v} - \mu \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},$$

for all $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$. Subtracting (4.1), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}, \boldsymbol{u}, p, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) - \mathcal{S}((\mathrm{L}_h, \boldsymbol{u}_h, p_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) \\ &\qquad + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \langle \frac{\nu}{h} \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\,,\ \boldsymbol{v} - \mu \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}, \end{aligned}$$

by the linearility of the first operator $\mathcal{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{S}((e_{\mathrm{L}}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_p, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \\ &\qquad - \mathcal{S}((\delta_{\mathrm{L}}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \delta_p, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) + \langle \frac{\nu}{h} \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\,,\ \boldsymbol{v} - \mu \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by the definition of the operator $\mathcal{S}$ and the orthogonality property of the L^2-projections we have the error equation:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{S}((e_{\mathrm{L}}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_p, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), ((\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}))) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{v}, \boldsymbol{\mu})) = \\ &\qquad \langle \nu \delta_{\mathrm{L}} \boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p \boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h} \mathit{\Pi}_M \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,,\ \boldsymbol{v} - \mu \rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}, \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

for all $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) \in \mathrm{G}_h \times \boldsymbol{V}_h \times Q_h \times \boldsymbol{M}_h^0$.

Step 2: Estimates for e_{L}, $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. We first apply an energy argument to bound the errors e_{L}, $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, which can be stated as follows:

Lemma 5.2. *If the exact solution $\boldsymbol{u}, \mathrm{L}, p$ is smooth enough, and $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}$ is small enough, we have*

$$\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\Omega} + |\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \le C_{HDG}(\|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\Omega} + h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1}.$$

Here the constant $\mathcal{C}$ depends on $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}, \|p\|_{k+1,\Omega}, \nu$ and k but independent of h.

Proof. Taking $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (e_{\mathrm{L}}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_p, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})$ in the error equation (5.3), the resulting equation can be simplified as

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\nu}{h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) = \\ \langle \nu\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,,\, e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},\end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}\nu\|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\Omega}^2 + \frac{\nu}{h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}^2 =& \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) \\ &+ \langle \nu\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,,\, e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.\end{aligned} \tag{5.4}$$

Let us first estimate the last term of the above equation. Applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \nu\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\,,\, e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &\le h^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\nu\|\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\delta_p\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \nu h^{-1}\|\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\Big)h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &\le h^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\nu\|\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\delta_p\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \nu h^{-1}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\Big)h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &\le C\Big(\|\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\Omega} + \|\delta_p\|_{\Omega} + h^{-1}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\Omega}\Big)|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \quad \text{by (5.1a)}, \\ &\le Ch^{k+1}(\|\mathrm{L}\|_{k+1,\Omega} + \|p\|_{k+1,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega})|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h} \quad \text{by (5.1b)}.\end{aligned}$$

The main effort in the analysis is to have an optimal estimate for the nonlinear terms, we rewrite these two terms into four parts:

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) \\ =\,& \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) &&: T_1 \\ +\,& \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u});(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) &&: T_2 \\ +\,& \mathcal{O}((\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u});(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) &&: T_3 \\ +\,& \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) &&: T_4\end{aligned}$$

Notice that the operator $\mathcal{O}$ is linear with respect to the last two components, so we have

$$T_1 = -\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h);(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) \le 0,$$

by Proposition 3.4. For T_2, we apply the estimate (3.2) in Lemma 3.5, we have

$$T_2 \le C_{\mathcal{O}}|\!|\!|(\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u},\mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u})|\!|\!|_{1,h}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}^2 \le C_{\mathcal{O}}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}^2.$$

For T_3, T_4, if we directly apply the continuity property of the operator $\mathcal{O}$ (3.2), we will only obtain suboptimal order of convergence. We can recover optimal convergence rate by a refined argument for each term. We start with T_4, by the linearity of $\mathcal{O}$ for the last two components, we have

$$\begin{aligned}T_4 &= -\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u});(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}),(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})) \\ &= (\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u},\nabla e_{\boldsymbol{u}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u})(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} := T_{41} + T_{42} + T_{43}.\end{aligned}$$

We now apply the generalized Hölder's inequality to bound these three terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}T_{41} &\le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,K}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_K\|\nabla e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_K \le Ch^{k+2}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}, \\ T_{42} &\le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K} \le C\|\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{E}_h}h^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{h+1,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}, \\ T_{43} &\le C\|\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\boldsymbol{n}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{E}_h}h^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{h+1,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}},e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}.\end{aligned}$$

For T_3, by the definition of $\mathcal{O}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 = {} & (\Pi_V \boldsymbol{u}\otimes \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla e_{\boldsymbol{u}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}})\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \frac{1}{2}(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ & + \langle(\tau_C(\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u})-\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u}))(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}. \end{aligned}$$

Among the five terms in the above expression, the third term needs some special treatment in order to obtain optimal convergence rates. For the others, we can bound them in a similar way as for T_{41}, T_{42}, T_{43}. For the sake of simplicity, here we show how to bound the last term and then focus on the third term. By applying the generalized Hölder's inequality on the last term, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle(\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &\le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h} \|\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K} h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K} h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K} \\ &\le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\mathcal{E}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+1,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step we applied the inequality:

$$\|\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K} \le C\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K}.$$

This result can be obtained by a simple scaling argument. Finally, let us focus on the third term. We rewrite the term as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\frac{1}{2}(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= \langle\frac{1}{2}(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &\quad - \langle\frac{1}{2}(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\ &= T_{31}+T_{32}+T_{33}. \end{aligned}$$

For T_{31}, we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality,

$$T_{31} \le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}-\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+1,\Omega}|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}.$$

For T_{32}, we have

$$T_{32} \le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial K}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial K}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}).$$

For T_{33}, inserting a zero term $\langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$ into T_{33} we obtain:

$$T_{33} = \langle\frac{1}{2}(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \sum_{K\in\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\infty,\partial K}h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial K}(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial K}) \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}(h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}).$$

The last step is to show that

$$h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le C|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}.$$

To this end, we apply a triangle inequality and (3.1c),

$$h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}-e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le C(\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\Omega} + h|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}) \le C|\!|\!|(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|\!|\!|_{1,h}.$$

This completes the estimate for T_3. Finally, if we combine the estimates for $T_1 - T_4$ and Lemma 3.1, we obtain the result stated in the Lemma 5.2. ☐

Step 3: Estimates for e_p. Next we present the optimal error estimate for e_p. As usual, we bound the pressure error via a *inf-sup* argument. It is well-known [2] that the following *inf-sup* condition holds for a polygonal domain Ω:

$$\sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in\boldsymbol{H}_0^1(\Omega)\backslash\{0\}} \frac{(\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{w}, q)_{\Omega}}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}} \ge \kappa\|q\|_{\Omega}, \quad \text{for all } q\in L_0^2(\Omega). \tag{5.5}$$

Here $\kappa > 0$ is independent of $\boldsymbol{w}, p$. We can bound e_p using the above result.

Lemma 5.3. *Under the same assumption as in Lemma 5.2, we have*

$$\|e_p\|_{\Omega} \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1}.$$

Here the constant $\mathcal{C}$ *depends on* $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}, \|p\|_{k+1,\Omega}, \nu, k$ *and* κ *but independent of* h.

Proof. Since $e_p \in L^2_0(\Omega)$, by (5.5) we have

$$\|e_p\|_\Omega \le \frac{1}{\kappa} \sup_{\boldsymbol{w}\in \boldsymbol{H}^1_0(\omega)\setminus\{0\}} \frac{(\nabla\cdot \boldsymbol{w}, e_p)_\Omega}{\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}}. \tag{5.6}$$

Now let us work on the numerator. Applying integration by parts and the orthogonality property of the projections Π_V, Π_M, we can rewrite it as follows:

$$(\nabla\cdot \boldsymbol{w}, e_p)_\Omega = (e_p, \nabla\cdot \Pi_V \boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle(\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, e_p\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = (e_p, \nabla\cdot\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, e_p\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}.$$

If we take $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (0, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, 0, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})$ in the error equation (5.3), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
(e_p, \nabla\cdot\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} &- \langle(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})\cdot\boldsymbol{n}, e_p\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \nu e_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}(\Pi_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&+ \langle \nu\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\Pi_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&+ \Big(\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}))\Big)\\
&:= T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we show that

$$T_1 + T_2 + T_3 + T_4 \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.$$

For T_1 we have

$$T_1 \le \nu\|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_\Omega \|\nabla\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega},$$

by Lemma 5.2 and (5.1). For T_2, by the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 &\le \nu(h^{\frac12}\|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{-\frac12}\|\Pi_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})(h^{-\frac12}\|\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.
\end{aligned}$$

T_3 can be estimated similarly as T_2. Finally, for the last term, we split into three terms as:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_4 = \;&\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) && : T_{41}\\
&+ \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) && : T_{42}\\
&+ \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) && : T_{43}.
\end{aligned}$$

We bound T_{4i} separately.

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{41} &= \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}))\\
&= (\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u})(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle(\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{n}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega\|\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}\|_\Omega + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\, h^{\frac12}(\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})\, h^{-\frac12}\|\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}-\Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+1,\Omega}|||(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})|||_{1,h} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega},
\end{aligned}$$

the last step is by the approximation properties of the projections (5.1a), (5.1b).

For T_{43}, due to the linearity of $\mathcal{O}$ on the last two components and (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{43} &= \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})) \le C|||(\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)|||_{1,h}\; |||(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|||_{1,h}\; |||(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})|||_{1,h}\\
&\le C(|||(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u})|||_{1,h} + |||(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|||_{1,h})\; |||(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})|||_{1,h}\; |||(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})|||_{1,h}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{1,\Omega}|||(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}, \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w})|||_{1,h} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega},
\end{aligned}$$

by (5.1) and Lemma 5.2.

For T_{42}, if we directly apply (5.1), we will only obtain suboptimal convergence rates. Alternatively, we need a refined analysis for this term. First, we let $E_{\boldsymbol{u}} := \boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h = e_{\boldsymbol{u}} + \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ and $E_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} := \boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}} = e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}} + \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}$. Next, by the definition of $\mathcal{O}$, we can write T_{42} as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{42} = &-(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes E_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac12(\nabla\cdot E_{\boldsymbol{u}})\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac12(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(E_{\boldsymbol{u}} - E_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&+ \langle(\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u}) - \tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))(\Pi_V\boldsymbol{u} - \Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}), \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w} - \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\Pi_M\boldsymbol{u}\otimes E_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \Pi_V\boldsymbol{w} - \Pi_M\boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= S_1 + \cdots + S_5.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that by Lemma 5.2 and (5.1b) we have

$$\|E_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{1,h} \le \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{1,h} + \|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{1,h} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}, \tag{5.7a}$$

$$\|E_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le Ch^{k+\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{5.7b}$$

by (5.1d), Lemma 5.2. Now we bound each of S_i. By the generalized Hölder's inequality, we have

$$S_1 \le \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|E_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\Omega}\|\nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\|_{\Omega} \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.$$

By a similar argument, we can bound S_2 as:

$$S_2 \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.$$

For S_4, we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality to have

$$\begin{aligned}
S_4 &\le h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u}) - \tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h)\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le Ch^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega},
\end{aligned}$$

by the estimate (5.7b) and (5.1).

By a similar argument we can bound S_5 as

$$S_5 \le Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}.$$

For the last term S_3, if we apply similar estimate as the others, we will only obtain suboptimal order convergence rates. Therefore, we need a refined estimate for this term. We rewrite S_3 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
S_3 &= \langle \frac{1}{2}(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes (e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}))\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \frac{1}{2}(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle \frac{1}{2}(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h} h^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}) - \langle \frac{1}{2}(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1} - \frac{1}{2}\langle(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},
\end{aligned}$$

by (5.1c), Lemma 5.2. For the last term, we further split it into two terms as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} &= \langle(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= -\langle((\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}) \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},
\end{aligned}$$

where the last step is obtained by inserting a zero term $\langle(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = \langle(\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}})\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{w}\rangle_{\partial\Omega} = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\ h^{\frac{1}{4}}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\ h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{w} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{w}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\le Ch^{k}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{1,h}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega} + Ch^{k+1}\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega}\\
&\le Ch^{k+1}(\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{2,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega})\|\boldsymbol{w}\|_{1,\Omega},
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last step we used the inequalities (3.1c), (5.1b), (5.1d). The proof is complete if we combine all the above estimates. $\square$

Step 4: Optimal estimate for $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. Notice that Lemma 5.2 provides an optimal estimate for e_{L} but only suboptimal estimate for $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$. This is due to the fact that we use a P_{k+1} polynomial space for the unknown $\boldsymbol{u}$. To obtain an optimal convergence estimate for $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$ we will use the adjoint problem (2.2) to apply a duality argument. We begin by the following identity for the error $e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$:

Lemma 5.4. *Let $(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \psi)$ be the solution of the dual problem* (2.2) *with the source term $\boldsymbol{\theta} = e_{\boldsymbol{u}}$, then we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega^2 = &- \langle e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \nu\delta_\Phi \boldsymbol{n} + \delta_\psi \boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- \langle \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&+ \langle \nu\delta_{\mathrm{L}}\boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p\boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- \Big((e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}))\Big) \\
&- \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi})) \\
&+ \Big(\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}))\Big) \\
&+ \Big(\mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h,\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u},\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi})) - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\Big) \\
&+ (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
:= &\, T_1 + \cdots + T_8.
\end{aligned}$$

Here $\boldsymbol{Y} := \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})^\top\boldsymbol{u} - \frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{u})^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}$ *and*

$$\delta_\Phi = \Phi - \mathit{\Pi}_G\Phi, \quad \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} := \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi}, \quad \delta_\psi := \psi - \mathit{\Pi}_Q\psi, \quad \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}} := \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}.$$

Proof. By the adjoint problem (2.2a) - (2.2c) we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega^2 = &- \nu(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

rearranging the terms, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
= &- \nu(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
= &- \nu(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot\mathit{\Pi}_G\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \mathit{\Pi}_G\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \nu(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot\delta_\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\mathit{\Pi}_Q\psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\delta_\psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

taking $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (\nu\mathit{\Pi}_G\Phi, 0, \mathit{\Pi}_Q\psi, 0)$ in the error equation (5.3), inserting the resulting identity into the above expression and simplifying, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
= &- \langle e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \nu\mathit{\Pi}_G\Phi\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \nu(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot\delta_\Phi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- \langle e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \mathit{\Pi}_Q\psi\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\delta_\psi)_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

inserting two zero terms: $\langle e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \nu\Phi\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} = \langle e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \psi\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}$ and integrating by parts in the first two lines to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
= &- \langle e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}, \nu\delta_\Phi\boldsymbol{n} + \delta_\psi\boldsymbol{n}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&- (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}.
\end{aligned}$$

Next we work on the last line in the above expression. We first insert the projection of $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ to have

$$\begin{aligned}
-(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, &\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&= (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}))_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&+ (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla\cdot\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

taking $(\mathrm{G}, \boldsymbol{v}, q, \boldsymbol{\mu}) = (0, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, 0, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})$ in the error equation (5.3), intergrating by parts for the last two terms in the above expression and simplifying, we have,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= -\langle \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \nu \delta_{\mathrm{L}} \boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p \boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&\quad - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) \\
&\quad - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi} \otimes \boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&\quad + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&= -\langle \frac{\nu}{h}(\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \nu \delta_{\mathrm{L}} \boldsymbol{n} - \delta_p \boldsymbol{n} - \frac{\nu}{h}\mathit{\Pi}_M \delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&\quad - \Big((e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \nabla \cdot (\boldsymbol{\phi} \otimes \boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) \Big) \\
&\quad - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \boldsymbol{u}); (\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) \\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) - \mathcal{O}((\boldsymbol{u}, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}); (\boldsymbol{u}_h, \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h), (\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}, \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi})) - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&\quad + (\nu e_{\mathrm{L}}, \nabla \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_p, \nabla \cdot \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h}.
\end{aligned}
$$

We can obtain the expression in the Lemma by inserting $(\boldsymbol{\phi}, \boldsymbol{\phi})$ in the two $\mathcal{O}$ terms in the above identity. This completes the proof. $\square$

Now we are ready to prove our last result:

Lemma 5.5. *Under the same assumption as in Lemma 5.2, in addition we assume the full H^2-regularity of the adjoint problem (2.3) holds and $k \geq 1$, then we have*

$$\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega \leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2},$$

Here the constant $\mathcal{C}$ depends on $\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega}, \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{W^{1,\infty}(\Omega)}, \|p\|_{k+1,\Omega}, \nu$ and k but independent of h.

Proof. By identity in Lemma 5.4, it suffice to estimate $T_1 - T_8$.

For T_1, we apply Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, Lemma 5.2, (5.1c) and the regularity inequality (2.3) to have

$$T_1 \leq h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} h^{\frac{1}{2}} \|\nu \delta_\Phi \boldsymbol{n} + \delta_\phi \boldsymbol{n}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C h^{k+1} \cdot h^{\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{1}{2}} (\|\Phi\|_{1,\Omega} + \|\phi\|_{1,\Omega}) \leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

Similarly, for T_2 we have

$$T_2 \leq \nu h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathit{\Pi}_M e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} h^{-\frac{1}{2}} \|\mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C h^{k+1} \cdot h^{-\frac{1}{2}} h^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{2,\Omega} \leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

Using Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.1c), (5.1d) and (2.3), we can bound T_3 as

$$T_3 \leq C h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} (\|\mathrm{L}\|_{k+1,\Omega} + \|p\|_{k+1,\Omega} + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega})\, h^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{2,\Omega} \leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

For T_8, we simply apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, (5.1b), Lemma 5.2, Lemma 5.3 and the regularity inequality (2.3) to have

$$T_8 \leq (\nu \|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_\Omega + \|e_p\|_\Omega) \|\nabla \delta_\phi\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \leq C h (\nu \|e_{\mathrm{L}}\|_\Omega + \|e_p\|_\Omega) \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{2,\Omega} \leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

For T_5, we explicitly write this term:

$$
\begin{aligned}
T_5 &= -(\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}} \otimes \boldsymbol{u}, \nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle \tau_C(\boldsymbol{u})(\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}), \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle (\boldsymbol{u} \otimes \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}) \boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \\
&\leq \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega} \Big(\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \|\nabla \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \|\mathit{\Pi}_M \boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_V \boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \Big) \\
&\leq C \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega} (h^{k+2} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+2,\Omega} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{1,\Omega} + h^{k+\frac{1}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{k+1,\Omega} h^{\frac{3}{2}} \|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{2,\Omega}) \quad \text{by (5.1b), (5.1c) and (5.1d)} \\
&\leq \mathcal{C} h^{k+2} \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega,
\end{aligned}
$$

by the regularity assumption (2.3).

For T_4, we first expand the term as:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_4 =& -(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, (\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\quad - \langle\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u})(e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
=& -(e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u}, \nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u})(e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}), \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - \langle(e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\otimes\boldsymbol{u})\boldsymbol{n}, \mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
\le& C\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}(\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega\|\nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + h^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}h^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{\phi} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h})\\
\le& \mathcal{C}h^{k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega + Ch^{\frac{3}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h},
\end{aligned}$$

by Lemma 5.2, (5.1b), (5.1c) and (5.1d). By a triangle inequality we have

$$\|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \mathcal{C}(h^{k+\frac{3}{2}} + h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}).$$

Inserting this inequality into the estimate for T_4 we obtain:

$$T_4 \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

To bound T_6, we first derive some useful inequalities, we first bound $\|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\infty,\Omega}$:

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\infty,\Omega} \le \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\infty,\Omega} + \|\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega} \le C(h^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}). \tag{5.8}$$

Next by a triangle inequality, we have

$$\|\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}} - e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\mathit{\Pi}_V\boldsymbol{u} - \mathit{\Pi}_M\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \mathcal{C}(h^{k+\frac{3}{2}} + h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}) \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5.9}$$

Consequently, we have

$$\|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1-\frac{d}{2}} + C(h^{-\frac{d}{2}}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega + \|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}). \tag{5.10}$$

The last step we applied a scaling argument for the polynomials on $\partial\mathcal{T}_h$. Finally, applying triangle inequality we obtain the following estimates:

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_\Omega \le \|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega + \|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1}, \tag{5.11a}$$

$$\|\nabla(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|\nabla e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+1}, \tag{5.11b}$$

$$\|\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \|\delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|e_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+\frac{1}{2}}. \tag{5.11c}$$

Now we are ready to present the estimate for T_6. If we expand T_6 using the definition of $\mathcal{O}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_6 =& -(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}) - (\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h))\boldsymbol{u}_h, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}) + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h - \boldsymbol{u}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&+ \langle(\tau_C(\boldsymbol{u}) - \tau_C(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle(\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

applying the generalized Hölder's inequality for each term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\le& \|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\infty,\Omega}(\|\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h\|_\Omega\|\nabla\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_\Omega) + \|\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&+ (\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega} + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h})\|\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + \|\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\infty,\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{\phi}} - \delta_{\widehat{\boldsymbol{\phi}}}\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}
\end{aligned}$$

now if we apply the inequalities (5.8) - (5.11), (5.1b) - (5.1d) and (2.3), we have

$$\le \mathcal{C}h^{k+2}(h^{k+1-\frac{d}{2}} + 1)\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega \le \mathcal{C}h^{k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

Finally, we need to estimate T_7 which is more involved than the previous terms. To this end, we begin by expanding the nonlinear operator $\mathcal{O}$:

$$T_7 = (\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\frac{1}{2}\nabla\cdot(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h)\boldsymbol{u}_h, \boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h},$$

integrating by parts the second term, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\quad - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{u}_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}_h - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + \langle\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u} - \boldsymbol{u}_h), \nabla\boldsymbol{u}_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}}, \boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h},
\end{aligned}$$

inserting the zero term $-\langle \frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}=0$ into above expression,

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\langle\frac{1}{2}((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} + (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}_h\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{u}_h)_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}},\boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= -\langle\frac{1}{2}((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h))_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\quad + (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (e_{\boldsymbol{u}},\boldsymbol{Y})_{\mathcal{T}_h},
\end{aligned}$$

by the definition of $\boldsymbol{Y}=\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})^\top\boldsymbol{u}-\frac{1}{2}(\nabla\boldsymbol{u})^\top\boldsymbol{\phi}$, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\langle\frac{1}{2}((\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h))\boldsymbol{n},\boldsymbol{\phi}\rangle_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} + (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h),\nabla(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h))_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&\quad + (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{u}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi})_{\mathcal{T}_h} - (\frac{1}{2}\boldsymbol{\phi}\otimes\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}},\nabla\boldsymbol{u})_{\mathcal{T}_h}\\
&= T_{71}+\cdots+T_{75}.
\end{aligned}$$

We are going to estimate each of the above terms. For T_{71} we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality, (3.1c), (5.11), and (2.3),

$$T_{71}\le\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\|\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{L^4(\partial\mathcal{T}_h)}\le Ch^{-\frac{1}{2}}\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{1,h}\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{1,h}\|\boldsymbol{u}-\widehat{\boldsymbol{u}}_h\|_{\partial\mathcal{T}_h}\le\mathcal{C}h^{2k+1}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

For T_{72}, we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality, (3.1a), (5.11) and (2.3) to get:

$$T_{72}\le\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|^2_{L^4(\Omega)}\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_\Omega\le C\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|^2_{1,h}\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{1,\Omega}\le\mathcal{C}h^{2k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

Similarly, we can bound T_{73} as

$$T_{73}\le\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_{L^4(\Omega)}\|\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h\|_{L^4(\Omega)}\|\nabla(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{u}_h)\|_{\mathcal{T}_h}\le\mathcal{C}h^{2k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.$$

For T_{74},T_{75} we apply the generalized Hölder's inequality as

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{74}&\le\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega\|\nabla\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_\Omega\le C\|\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}h^{k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega,\\
T_{75}&\le\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}\|\boldsymbol{\phi}\|_\Omega\|\delta_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega\le C\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_{\infty,\Omega}h^{k+2}\|e_{\boldsymbol{u}}\|_\Omega.
\end{aligned}$$

The proof is complete by combining all the estimates for T_1-T_8. $\square$

6. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we introduced and analyzed a new HDG method for the Navier-Stokes equations. The work can be seen as a continuation of our previous work on HDG methods for linear problems, see [25, 26]. Comparing with the original HDG method for Navier-Stokes equation [6, 23], our method uses an enriched polynomial space for the velocity in each element, a modified numerical flux and a modified HDG formulation. As a concequence, we obtained optimal order of convergence for all unknowns and superconvergence for the velocity without postprocessing. In addition, similar as in [25, 26], the analysis in this paper is valid for general polygonal meshes.

Numerical study of the method as well as other computational aspects including the characterization of the scheme, implementation of the method using Picard iteration and other related issues will be extensively discussed in a separate paper.

REFERENCES

[1] G. A. Baker, W.N. Jureidini, and O. A. Karakashian, *Piecewise solenoidal vector fields and the Stokes problem*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **27** (1990), 1466–1485.

[2] F. Brezzi and M. Fortin, *Mixed and hybrid finite element methods*, Springer Verlag, 1991.

[3] Z. Cai, G. Kanschat, C. Wang, and S. Zhang, *Mixed finite element methods for incompressible flow: stationary Navier-Stokes equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **48(1)** (2010), 79–94.

[4] Z. Cai, G. Kanschat, C. Wang, and S. Zhang, *Mixed finite element methods for stationary Navier-Stokes equations based on pseudostress-pressure-velocity formulation*, Math. Comp. **81** (2012), 1903–1927.

[5] J. Carrero, B. Cockburn, and D. Schötzau, *Hybridized, globally divergence-free LDG methods. Part I: The Stokes problem*, Math. Comp. **75** (2006), 533–563.

[6] A. Cesmelioglu, B. Cockburn and W. Qiu, *Analysis of an HDG method for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations*, submitted, (2015).

[7] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, D. Schötzau, and C. Schwab, *Local discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes system*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **40** (2002), 319–343.

[8] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, and D. Schötzau, *A locally conservative LDG method for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations*, Math. Comp. **74** (2005), 1067–1095.

[9] ______, *A note on discontinuous Galerkin divergence-free solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Sci. Comput. **31** (2007), 61–73.

[10] B. Cockburn, G. Kanschat, and D. Schötzau, *An equal-order DG method for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Sci. Comput. **40** (2009), no. 1-3, 188–210. MR 2511732 (2010i:65263)

[11] B. Cockburn, W. Qiu and K. Shi, *Conditions for superconvergence of HDG methods for second-order elliptic problems.* Math. Comp., **81** (2012), pp. 1327–1353.

[12] M. Fortin, *Finite element solution of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Acta Numerica **5** (1993), 239–284.

[13] V. Girault and P. A. Raviart, *Finite element approximations of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1986.

[14] V. Girault, B. Rivière, and M. F. Wheeler, *A discontinuous Galerkin method with non-overlapping domain decomposition for the Stokes and Navier-Stokes problems*, Math. Comp. **74** (2005), 53–84.

[15] J.S. Howell and N.J. Walkington, *Dual-mixed finite element methods for the Navier-Stokes equations*, ESAIM:M2AN **47** (2013), 789–805.

[16] T. Hughes and L.P. Franca, *A new finite element formulation for computational fluid dynamics, VII. The Stokes problem with various well-posed boundary conditions: Symmetric formulations that converge for all velocity/pressure spaces*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **65** (1987), 85–96.

[17] T. Hughes, L.P. Franca, and M. Balestra, *A new finite element formulation for computational fluid dynamics, V. Circumventing the Babuška-Brezzi condition: A stable Petrov-Galerkin formulation of the Stokes problem accommodating equal-order interpolations*, Comput. Methods Appl. Mech. Engrg. **59** (1986), 85–99.

[18] O.A. Karakashian and W.N. Jureidini, *A nonconforming finite element method for the stationary Navier-Stokes equations*, SIAM J. Numer. Anal. **35** (1998), no. 1, 93–120. MR 1618436 (99d:65320)

[19] N. Kechkar and D.J. Silvester, *Analysis of locally stabilized mixed finite element methods for the Stokes problem*, Math. Comp. **58** (1992), 1–10.

[20] C. Lehrenfeld, *Hybrid Discontinuous Galerkin methods for solving incompressible flow problems* Diplomingenieur Thesis (2010).

[21] A. Montlaur, S. Fernández-Méndez, and A. Huerta, *Discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Stokes equations using divergence-free approximations*, Internat. J. Numer. Methods Fluids **57** (2008), no. 9, 1071–1092.

[22] A. Montlaur, S. Fernández-Méndez, J. Peraire, and A. Huerta, *Discontinuous Galerkin methods for the Navier-Stokes equations using solenoidal approximations*, International Journal for Numerical Methods in Fluids **64** (2010), no. 5, 549–564.

[23] N.C. Nguyen, J. Peraire, and B. Cockburn, *An implicit high-order hybridizable discontinuous Galerkin method for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations*, Journal of Computational Physics **230** (2011), no. 4, 1147 – 1170.

[24] I. Oikawa, *A Hybridized Discontinuous Galerkin Method with Reduced Stabilization.* J. Sci. Comput., **65** 2015), no. 1, 327 – 340.

[25] W. Qiu, J. Shen and K. Shi, *An HDG method for linear elasticity with strong symmetric stresses.* arXiv:1312.1407, submitted.

[26] W. Qiu and K. Shi, *An HDG Method for Convection Diffusion Equation.* J. Sci. Comput. 2015, DOI 10.1007/s10915-015-0024-5

[27] D. Schötzau, C. Schwab, and A. Toselli, *Stabilized hp-DGFEM for incompressible flow*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **13** (2003), 1413–1436.

[28] A. Toselli, *hp-discontinuous Galerkin approximations for the Stokes problem*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci. **12** (2002), 1565–1616.

[29] C. Waluga, *Analysis of Hybrid Discontinuous Galerkin Methods for Incompressible Flow Problems*, Diplomingenieur thesis (2012).

Department of Mathematics, City University of Hong Kong, 83 Tat Chee Avenue, Kowloon, Hong Kong, China
E-mail address: `weifeqiu@cityu.edu.hk`

Department of Mathematics & Statistics, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, VA 23529, USA
E-mail address: `kshi@odu.edu`